

Language whereby the conferees "expect the Secretary, to the extent practicable, to avoid the use of reductions-in-force or furloughs for both Federal and non-federal employees or any county office closings"; or,

Prohibitive language which prevents the expenditure of funds made available by the Food and Drug Administration to close or relocate, or to plan to close or relocate, the Food and Drug Division of Drug Analysis in St. Louis, Missouri.

Mr. President, I am not trying to undermine the hard work of the conferees for they do have a difficult responsibility. I commend the managers on both sides of the aisle in working out a careful compromise. Unfortunately, the Agriculture Appropriations conference report is representative of legislative circumvention and the troubling practice of pork-barrel spending.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. COCHRAN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST— S. RES. 264, ESTABLISHING A DAY OF CONCERN FOR YOUNG PEOPLE AND GUN VIOLENCE

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Judiciary Committee be discharged from further consideration of S. Res. 264 and that the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration, that the resolution and preamble be agreed to en bloc, and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table without intervening action.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mrs. MURRAY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I really regret the objection and I rise today to really plead with my colleagues to lift the hold on this really simple, bipartisan resolution that simply encourages our children to stay away from gun violence. I thank my friend and colleague, Senator KEMPTHORNE, who has been working with me to try to move this resolution.

In 2 days it will be October 8, the day this resolution calls upon the President to establish a Day of National Concern for Young People and Gun Violence. In 2 days, the Senate will have missed an opportunity to send a message to our kids that gun violence is the wrong way to solve problems.

Fortunately, groups like the National Parent-Teacher Association, Mothers Against Violence in America, the American Medical Association, and others are spreading the word without our help. They are encouraging young people all over this country to sign a pledge and promise they will never take a gun to school; will never use a gun to settle a dispute; and will use their influence to prevent friends from using guns to settle disputes. That is what this resolution is about.

Mr. President, this is exactly the message the United States Senate should be sending to our children. We want them to make a personal commitment against violence. We want them to help convince their friends to do the same. We want them to join together to fight against youth violence. Just like we should be doing.

We must pass this resolution. Let me read to you a list of the Senators who have committed themselves to establishing this day of concern and helping steer kids away from violence: Senators KEMPTHORNE, LAUTENBERG, SMITH of Oregon, KENNEDY, BAUCUS, SPECTER, ROBB, AKAKA, SARBANES, CHAFEE, LIEBERMAN, FAIRCLOTH, JEFFORDS, GORTON, REID of Nevada, D'AMATO, DASCHLE, ROCKEFELLER, KERREY of Nebraska, LUGAR, FEINGOLD, BUMPERS, ABRAHAM, CRAIG, COLLINS, WELLSTONE, COCHRAN, GRAMS, GRAHAM of Florida, DURBIN, BOXER, HUTCHISON, LEVIN, GLENN, MOSELEY-BRAUN, BIDEN, MOYNIHAN, FEINSTEIN, DODD, BINGAMAN, TORRICELLI, JOHNSON, BREAUX, WARNER, FRIST, INOUE, LANDRIEU, BURNS, KOHL, KERRY of Massachusetts, WYDEN, CONRAD, BUMPERS, MIKULSKI, MCCAIN, SNOWE, NICHOLSON, CAMPBELL, and BENNETT. There are 59 Senators who are cosponsors of this simple resolution to prevent gun violence amongst our youths.

We all are convinced the best way to prevent gun violence is by reaching out to individual children and helping them make the right decisions. This resolution gives parents, teachers, government leaders, service clubs, police departments, and others a special day to focus on the problems caused by young people and gun violence. October is National Crime Prevention Month—the perfect time to center our attention on the special needs of our kids and gun violence.

A Minnesota homemaker, Mary Lewis Grow, developed this idea for a Day of Concern for Young People and Gun Violence. This will be the third year the Senate has passed a resolution urging kids to take the pledge against gun violence. In 1997, 47,000 students in Washington State signed the pledge card, as did more than 200,000 children in New York City, and tens of thousands more across the country.

Just think of the lives we could have saved if all students had signed—and lived up to—such a pledge last year. Consider that in the months between today and the day we demonstrated our concern about youth violence last year,

we have had an outbreak of school violence. Eleven students and two teachers have been killed and more than 40 students have been wounded in shootings by children. In addition, we have lost thousands of children in what has become the all-too-common violence of drive-by shootings, drug wars, and other crime and in self-inflicted and unintentional shootings.

Last year, Senator KEMPTHORNE and I led the cosponsorship drive of this resolution after his 17-year-old neighbor was murdered by a 19-year-old in a random act of violence in Washington State. Ann Harris' parents vowed to transform their grief into an opportunity to help teach our young people to care about each other and to stop the violence. This month, they are suffering through the trial of her accused killer. We should support them.

Mr. President, we must, absolutely must pass this resolution. I urge whomever has a hold on this resolution urging young people to say no to gun violence to drop his or her hold and let us send a message from the United States Senate to every young person in America: Stop gun violence now.

I yield the floor.

RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate stands in recess, under the previous order, until 2:15.

Thereupon, at 12:44 p.m., the Senate recessed until 2:15 p.m.; whereupon, the Senate reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. HUTCHINSON).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair, in his capacity as a Senator from the State of Arkansas, suggests the absence of a quorum. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AGRICULTURAL, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1999—CONFERENCE REPORT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the order of business is the agriculture conference report.

The Senate continued with consideration of the conference report.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I know that there is a vote at 3:15. I wanted the opportunity to address the conference report prior to that vote.

Let me begin first by complimenting the distinguished Chair for the manner in which he has conducted himself in this debate, as he does with all debate. We may have deep differences of opinion on this particular issue, but in true form he has been a statesman and, I

think, a model for all of us in the way he has conducted himself. As I say, I take issue with the bill but certainly not with the manager and the Chair of the committee. He has in so many cases done an outstanding job.

Let me also applaud our distinguished ranking member. This will probably be the final bill that he manages. He knows how strongly I feel about him and the friendship that I have and feel toward him. He is one of the finest Members of the Senate who has ever served, in my opinion. We will miss him more than we can ever possibly express. It is with sadness that I acknowledge that this may be his last bill, but it is with a great deal of satisfaction in looking back over the past 12 years in my service with him that I share many fond memories and many extraordinary legislative success stories.

The conference report that is before the Senate is one that I believe fails to recognize the extraordinary nature of the circumstances we find ourselves in in the agricultural industry across this country. People on both sides of the aisle acknowledge the seriousness of the crisis. They acknowledge the fact that prices continue to plummet. Many of my colleagues on the Democratic side have indicated that grain prices have already fallen at least 25 percent below the 1997 level.

I have asked people in the media and around the country to imagine what would happen if Wall Street prices had fallen in 1 year by 25 percent. How many Wall Street Journal articles would we see? How many front page stories in the daily newspapers would we see if prices plummeted that far? Obviously, there would be tremendous national anxiety about those circumstances.

That is exactly what has happened in agriculture. Prices have plummeted by more than 25 percent. There are some who believe that "business as usual" is acceptable here. I am not suggesting that our Republican colleagues have approached this matter with that in mind, but I do believe that there is a significant difference of opinion. Unfortunately, it does break partly along partisan lines in recognizing the depth of the problem and in dealing with it prior to the time we leave this year.

Livestock producers today are losing somewhere between \$100 and \$150 per head. A number of States in the Midwest are likely to lose at least 20 percent of our farmers in the coming year, according to state secretaries of agriculture—these are not my figures, but the secretaries of agriculture in the upper Great Plains who are reporting to us that one out of every five farm and ranch families will probably be forced off their farm or ranch as a result of the circumstances we are facing today. In South Dakota, that means perhaps as many as 7,000 producers who will no longer have the livelihood they have right now.

Nationwide, we expect an \$11.4 billion reduction in farm income. That is over

20 percent. The sad thing is that the Department of Agriculture has just released new figures to suggest that there is no real hope in sight. The fact is, for at least the next 12 months we don't see circumstances improving.

The last time the Congress was in a situation similar to this was the mid-eighties. At that time, we had a safety net; we had policy positions that allowed us the opportunity to respond more equitably. Some might argue that maybe we went too far. I don't know, what is too far? All I know is, during that critical timeframe, in 1986 dollars, we committed \$26 billion to respond to the disaster. Now a lot of that was not decided in the Senate, because there was a safety net already in place. But it was so bad, we committed \$26 billion in ways that would soften the blow and keep farmers and ranchers on the farm. It did. A lot of them dug out, got back in the black, and continued to be productive, tax-paying members of rural communities all across this country.

What we are suggesting is, we can't afford \$26 billion, we can't afford \$20 billion, we can't afford half that amount, \$13 billion. All we can probably commit to, given the array of needs that are out there and given our circumstances, is \$7 billion.

The secretaries of agriculture said, "That isn't enough, we need \$9 billion," and wrote in a letter to us just last week, "We need \$9 billion, not \$7 billion."

What do our Republican colleagues propose? Something less than four—over \$3 billion, a fraction of what we did in 1986 when the circumstances were as bad as they are now.

Mr. President, what we are saying is that given the fact that we could be out of session sine die—that is, without any real expectation of coming back before the next Congress—and recognizing that in the next Congress there is very little chance of being back in this position in January or February during the cold winter months, perhaps not even in March or April—it could be at least 6 months before we have a chance to really seriously consider this situation again. We are simply saying that we cannot commit only this meager amount of resources to a situation that, in many respects, is every bit as bad if not worse than in 1986. This cannot be the full extent of our response. That is what the President is saying. The President has reluctantly said that he will veto this legislation. He will either veto it today or tomorrow. It will be vetoed this week.

So there is no doubt that we are going to be coming back and we are going to have to make a decision as a result of that veto about what we do. Our hope is that our colleagues can come to some resolution quickly. It appears that we are going to have to go through the veto to come back to the table. But, indeed, we will come back.

So, Mr. President, that is where I believe we have found ourselves. We

must, when we come back, negotiate a relief package that is based at least on several principles that I hope will enjoy broad, bipartisan support. First, we must have strong indemnity-related relief for farmers with no crop, and meaningful income relief for farmers with a crop at low prices. In other words, there are two categories of farmers who are in desperate condition today. In many cases in the South, we have a problem of farmers not having a crop. I know that is especially true in Louisiana, and I suspect it is true in other Southern States as well. In the Northeastern States, we have a problem of having a crop, but absolutely no prices. And so we have circumstances that vary, depending on the geographic area. Whatever it is we do, I hope we can agree that both circumstances have to be addressed.

Secondly, income assistance must be linked to 1998 crop year production. We don't know what it is going to be in 1999. We are told it is not going to get any better. So we must focus on the 1998 crop year and target producers, not just anyone with an AMTA or Freedom to Farm contract, but all producers who otherwise will have no hope of finding the kind of financial security or relief that they need to get through these winter months.

I hope, Mr. President, that we also could agree, on a bipartisan basis, that losses born by livestock producers who have never had a farm program, and for whom fair trade legislation is critical, could be dealt with successfully as well. There are two things that the Senate did in July that I hope, on a bipartisan basis, we could restore once we come back to the table. The first is country of origin meat labeling. I don't think there is anything that would help more, psychologically as well as financially, than to have the same requirement for meat that we have for virtually every other imported product—labeling. Our farmers and ranchers have said that they believe that, more than anything else, this would improve competition in the retail and wholesale marketplaces. If the American consumer knew what it was they were eating and where it was from, our farmers and ranchers agree almost unanimously that they would be in a much stronger and competitive position.

The second is to do something that they talk about almost anywhere I go in the country, but especially in the Dakotas, and my home State of South Dakota in particular, and that is improve price transparency. Increase market reporting of prices paid for livestock, specifically by the big packers of formula contract prices. We all know what is happening right now. Secret contracts are being signed with no appreciation for what the market is. That has a devastating effect on the marketplace. Farmers are left in the dark. It would be like going to buy a car or a pickup, or any kind of product, and not knowing what the price was

and not knowing what the comparable prices are in the industry and wondering, based upon your best judgment, whether you were getting a good deal or not. We would not do that were we buying a car. We could not do that if we were buying a house. Yet, every day our farmers and ranchers are expected to pit themselves against the big packers and try to guess, using some crystal ball that they don't have, what the market looks like out there. So they are given a price, and in a very short timeframe, they have to decide whether that is a good deal or not. They are losing \$100 to \$150 a head right now. So we know what kind of deals they are getting.

We need price transparency. The Senate responded favorably to both of those proposals, but unfortunately they were dropped in conference. I am very hopeful that they can be restored. These are steps we can take immediately that will send a clear message that we understand the circumstances that livestock producers are in. And now is the time for us to deal with it, not next spring after we have lost tens of thousands of producers all over the country.

Some of these matters that we have debated have a cost-related function. Mr. President, there is no cost to labeling, and there is no cost to mandatory price reporting. Keep in mind, we are suggesting that we would even settle, at least at this point, for a pilot study of those options. Let's analyze what happens when we have full price reporting. Let's analyze what happens when we have meat labeling. We are willing to sunset both of these in 2 to 3 years in an effort to evaluate whether or not they have worked. At least let's get started. I don't think that is too much to ask.

So, Mr. President, that is why many of us have taken such a strong position on this conference report. Number one, it is our last shot at providing some meaningful economic assistance to agriculture, and, number two, it is an opportunity that we may not have again for 7 or 8 months. We can't wait that long. Our package—the proposal that we are hoping our colleagues would consider—is fair, and it is balanced among all regions suffering low prices and disaster. It is targeted to the people who need it; that is, producers of 1998 crops. It is fiscally responsible. Price relief is linked to the market price, and it addresses the real needs of agriculture.

Mr. President, what time remains? Is time allocated to both sides?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There was an hour, equally divided, starting at 2:15, with a vote scheduled at 3:15.

Mr. DASCHLE. How much time remains on my side?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has just under 6½ minutes.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I see no other Democratic Senators on the floor, so I will use the remainder of the time.

We believe that our proposal is also fiscally responsible. We link price relief to the market price, and we certainly recognize that it addresses the real problems that we are facing across the board in agriculture. I think our colleagues on the other side have failed to address the dual nature of the crisis—that is, loss of crops and loss of income. I believe they are failing to recognize the severity of the crisis. As I noted earlier, Mr. President, our Secretaries of Agriculture—the Association of State Departments of Agriculture—held an emergency conference last week to propose to us what they believe ought to be done. Frankly, they said both of our relief packages were inadequate. They said that even \$7 billion was inadequate, and even all the policy changes we are recommending did not do what they felt was needed to address the level of need they see today. So if \$7 billion and all of the policy changes we have recommended doesn't even cut it, \$3.5 billion doesn't cut it, either.

Over 150 Members of the House voted to send this bill back to conference. I hope that a large number of our colleagues on both sides of the aisle will agree to send it back as well. We simply can't leave this Congress without providing essential disaster relief.

We must not lose this opportunity. We have a true emergency—an emergency that I think jeopardizes farmers' and ranchers' survival in a myriad of ways, and the survival, frankly, of rural communities all across this country. The loss in income that we are seeing has already started to translate into lost farms and ranches.

When I was home recently a friend told me that a banker he knows is going to be forced to foreclose on 35 farms in just one small community in South Dakota alone this winter. The banker is so disturbed by what he is experiencing that he has actually joined a community prayer group just to deal with the stress he is feeling.

Another friend who is concerned about the impact that the depressed farm economy is having on communities generally, said that a local cleaning service has laid off all of its employees because they have had no business since the end of July.

These stories and many, many more are unfolding across the country. As my colleagues have noted already during this debate, we simply cannot leave until we have successfully dealt with this matter. I hope that we can earnestly come to some closure, successfully recognizing the importance of this issue and dealing with it in as comprehensive a manner as is humanly possible. The stakes are too high. The ramifications of failure are too high. Our only real chance to address this matter now is with this legislation.

Mr. President, I urge a "no" vote on the conference report. I will support the President's veto. More than enough Members of this Senate have indicated already that they will support the

President's veto. When that happens, let's get back to work, and let's deal with this issue successfully.

I yield the floor.

Mr. COCHRAN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished Senator from Wyoming.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming is recognized.

Mr. THOMAS. Thank you, Mr. President.

Mr. President, first of all, let me thank the Senator from Mississippi for the work that he has done on this agriculture appropriations bill. It is a very difficult one. It is a large bill of \$56 billion. It is very difficult. It comes at a time when we are seeking, I think properly, to make a transition from the old farm programs with the acreage allotments and the subsidies to a market system which, in my State at least, most farmers and ranchers believe we should do. Coupled with that, of course, has come some unfortunate weather disasters, flooding and those kinds of things and crop failures as well. And certainly the Asian currency problem has had an impact in terms of available foreign markets, which is very important when nearly 40 percent of agricultural products are sold in that way.

So now we are faced with the problem of seeking to deal with these problems. Everybody wants to do that. Everybody wants to be helpful for agriculture. Then we need to find the proper way to do it. We need to be able to do this in a way that I think does not cause us to deviate from our policy position, which is to return to a marketplace in agriculture.

We are doing a great deal for agriculture in this bill. There will be transition payments. There will be payments for disasters. As a matter of fact, as I understand it, the figures that I have indicate that through 1996 and 1998 farmers have been paid approximately \$17 billion under the old bill. That would have been \$10 billion. There has been a substantial increase there. Farmers will receive approximately \$500 billion from the banks in transition payments in October of this year.

Actually all these numbers added together equal \$31 billion paid to farmers and ranchers over the past 3 years. If you take the 1998 bonus in advance for 1999, we would be paying \$15 billion out in this 1 year.

There is a substantial interest being made and properly being made. There are other things, in my view, that need to be done as well. We need to do something about increasing foreign markets, of course. I happen to be on the Foreign Relations Committee and am chairman of the Subcommittee on Asia. We are trying to do some things to reclaim that market—in all kinds of ways to get those markets back, particularly for agriculture.

We have done something about the unilateral sanctions—the idea that if

something happens in Asia or Pakistan that the first thing you do is sanction off the sales of agricultural products. We have made some changes there, as indeed we should.

I believe we should move forward in doing something with income averaging on a permanent basis for agriculture. This is the kind of an industry where you may have a very good year, or have a very poor year, and you should be able to income average.

We need savings accounts for farmers so they hold back in good years so they are able to do better.

Crop insurance—crop interests need to be revised the way it came out of the farm bill. That was changed and has not been effective. We need to do that.

It is interesting. Our friends on the other side of the aisle talk about this increase, and the President is now making speeches on Saturday, and so on. It turns out that he started out asking for less than \$1 billion. It went up to \$2 billion, and suddenly politically he has gone up to \$7 billion, and probably more.

We have to really deal with this on that basis.

Mr. President, I wanted to say that I am disappointed in a couple of areas. I come from a State, of course, where the major activity in agriculture is livestock—cattle and sheep. I was very much interested in our moving forward with this matter of labels; this country of origin kind of thing so that buyers could decide what kind of meats they choose to buy, whether they want to have American-made meats or meats from other countries. But they should be able to know that. We put that in the Senate bill and lost it in the conference. I am very disappointed in that.

We also, I believe, need to have our market reporting strengthened so that all the cattle and all of the sheep that go in the market will be reported as part of the market, not those things that are held by packers and never reported that would impact the crisis.

I am disappointed in those things. I hope that we can go forward.

There is some indication apparently from the conference committee that we would go forward with the study of the labeling. I hope we do.

On the other hand, I think it is going to be slow that way. I wish, frankly, that we could change it before we have to go back and do it that way.

Mr. President, I just wanted to say that I admire very much the work that has been done. I know we must do something in agriculture. We are poised to do something.

I wanted to point out the two areas of disappointment that I have—that of labeling in the country of origin, and that of transparency in market prices. We need something we can do about that.

Mr. President, I thank you for the time. I yield the floor.

Mr. COCHRAN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, may I inquire? How much time remains on the conference report on both sides?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi has 16 minutes; the minority has 2 minutes 21 seconds.

Mr. COCHRAN. I thank the Chair.

Mr. BAUCUS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana.

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I am not managing time on our side. Did the Chair say the minority has 2 minutes 21 seconds remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. BAUCUS. I wonder if my very great, good friend, the Senator from Mississippi, would yield me some time, although I must upfront say that I am arguing against the conference report.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, let me inquire of the Senator, how much time does he seek?

Mr. BAUCUS. I was going to speak maybe 5 minutes.

Mr. COCHRAN. I have no objection.

Mr. BAUCUS. I thank my very, very good friend from Tennessee—Mississippi—

Mr. COCHRAN. If you do not get my State right, I will not yield time.

Mr. BAUCUS. I will use some of my time to praise you because that is very generous of the Senator from Mississippi, and it is typical of his generosity and his graciousness. He is a very, very fine man.

Mr. President, sometimes we have to disagree with one another, and I am about to say that as much as I respect and admire the Senator from Mississippi, I have a different view than he has on this issue.

Mr. President, I rise toady to express my profound disappointment in the conference report before the Senate.

The words of our forefathers speak volumes about many topics, including this one. "Blessed is the man who expects nothing, for he shall never be disappointed." These words were written in a letter from Alexander Pope over 270 years ago. They paraphrase biblical verse. I believe they speak to rural America today about the farm relief provisions included in this conference report.

But more accurately they speak to the matters excluded from this package.

This package should include meaningful relief for farmers in the worst economic crunch of this decade. Instead, it includes a pittance. While the conferees could have adopted a package that provided roughly 60 cents per bushel on wheat in addition to what farmers get now, which is virtually nothing in the market, the conferees did not provide that 60 cents. Instead, the bill provides 13 cents per bushel. That is how it works out.

Frankly, I am stunned. I assumed that when the conferees met they would work out some kind of compromise. The Democratic package had eliminated the loan caps, it had the

country of origin labeling, a provision providing for price reporting on a pilot project basis of fat cattle bought by packers. It included several provisions which would have helped farmers just a little bit.

On the other side of the aisle, on the Republican side, there was not much at all; as I said, 13 cents as opposed to 60 cents, with respect to wheat.

Mr. President, this package could only satisfy a farmer who expects nothing. I fear, as I hear from disillusioned producers across Montana, far too many producers expect this Congress to fail in the effort to help out.

They believe instead that their pleas are falling on deaf ears. Their disaster is being seen in academic terms. Their future—the survival of their farms and ranches has become little more than a laboratory test of the farm policy enacted a couple years ago.

I still believe in our producers—the top industry in our state. But that very industry that generated about \$2 billion in sales last year will lose nearly \$200 million this year. The Republican package will short Montana producers another \$100 million. Then multiply it by our treacherous rank—46th in the Nation for per capita income—and you get a grand total of \$300 million that Montana can't afford to lose—not on the farm and not on Main Street. Thus, what we do now portends what will happen in the next year in our rural communities.

I think it is very irresponsible to end this Congress without meaningful relief for our farmers and ranchers. We need to eliminate the loan rate cap for this year and provide the funding to make it work.

We need to mandate country of origin labeling on meat. And we need to require price reporting on the livestock sold each day.

We need to treat this situation like the crisis it is to producers across Montana and across our country.

Mr. President, I assumed the two sides would get together and work out some kind of compromise. That is not what happened. Instead, the majority party—I do not like being partisan about this stuff but I just have to be accurate—the majority party did not compromise at all. They just stuck with their 13 cents and also stuck with rejecting country of origin labeling on beef, stuck with rejecting entirely the pilot project on mandatory price reporting, instead replacing it with a study—essentially totally agreed to a pittance to farmers.

I must say, Mr. President—this is no exaggeration, I am not exaggerating—farmers find this an insult. They find it a slap in the face. They cannot believe that the U.S. Congress is sitting here in many respects worried more about Ken Starr—certainly the majority side—than they are about paying attention to farmers and what is happening in the country.

I have to tell you, Mr. President, it is really a bad situation in farm country.

Bankers are not going to be able to extend loans. Worse than that, they are going to begin to call in loans. Implement dealers, car dealers, grocery stores, hardware stores in farm communities are finding their sales way down. That means they have to start digging deeper into their pockets. This is the worst situation I have seen in at least 10 or 12 years. And 10 or 12 years ago, in the late 1980s when farmers were facing about the same situation—again, through no fault of their own, because of drought and because of world conditions—Congress spent about \$16 billion to help farmers.

Mr. President, 10 or 12 years ago we spent \$16 billion. Today the Democratic side is asking for, not \$16 billion, \$7 billion; and the Republican side said no, no, not even \$7 billion, but \$4 billion. We are saying, we on our side of the aisle: Hey, \$4 billion is an insult. It is a slap in the face.

I plead with Senators to go back again and see if we can figure out some way to agree, if not to the full 7, to virtually the 7.

Another point: I have been in the Senate a few years. I voted for the New York City bailout, I voted for the Chrysler bailout, I voted for California disaster assistance. Guess what. All those efforts have been repaid—in spades.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KEMPTHORNE). The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. BAUCUS. I ask the Senator for 1 minute on the time of our side.

Mr. BUMBERS. I yield 1 minute.

Mr. BAUCUS. When we loaned money to New York City a few years ago, New York repaid that loan with interest, ahead of time. When we loaned Chrysler Corporation money to get its feet back on the ground, that loan was repaid ahead of time. I am just saying, today, if we can help farmers a little bit today with the conditions they face through no fault of their own, because the world market supply is so large and the price is so low, and the Asian economic crisis, at the very least that will be repaid back again in spades.

I urge my colleagues, please show a little bit of statesmanship and vote to help this part of our country. It is going to come back and help all of us as a nation.

I thank very much my very good friend from Mississippi, again, for his very generous offer to give me some time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, I yield myself the remainder of the time on our side.

Let me say to the distinguished Senator from Montana, I appreciate his courtesies as well. It is a pleasure working with him on these issues. I am sorry we have to disagree on some of the issues contained in this agriculture appropriations conference report.

On the subject that the Senator mentions, and also the Democratic leader

when he was speaking mentioned as a reason why the President ought to veto this legislation, was the question of price reporting and meat labeling. These are two separate issues. Frankly, I was surprised by the comments and also including this as a basis for urging the President to veto the legislation.

When we passed our bill in July, we received the reaction following that, after the administration had an opportunity to study the legislation—we received the reaction in a formal letter from the Secretary of Agriculture dated September 24, a "Dear Thad" letter from Dan Glickman.

Included is a table going down through the bills. This is prior to conference now—I think that is right—prior to our going to the conference with the House conferees to work out differences between the House- and Senate-passed bills. In Secretary Glickman's letter pointing out their reaction to the Senate-passed bill and the provisions in the House bill, they get down to the meat labeling provision, which is title X in the Senate bill. There is no House provision on that subject. The USDA position as conveyed in this letter to me says: Working with Congress to address concerns about adverse trade effects and concerns that implementation would divert resources needed to address important food safety issues.

We tried to work with the administration, and did, to address those concerns. If the administration had been supportive of the meat labeling provisions, they would have said so, because they go right down through the list and support some other provisions. Or if they opposed it, they point it out and they say so.

Here is another example, the Biodiesel Energy Development Act, which the administration says, to a separate bill in the House, the administration opposes.

The administration did not say that they supported the meat labeling. They suggested they had concerns about it and they wanted to work with the Congress to address those concerns. So here is what we did in conference to try to address those concerns. We provided conference report language, statement of managers, to this effect:

The conferees direct the Secretary to conduct a comprehensive study on the potential effects of mandatory country of origin labeling of imported fresh muscle cuts of beef and lamb. The report shall include the impact of such requirements on imports, exports, livestock producers, consumers, processors, packers, distributors and grocers.

We went on to say:

The report shall be submitted to Congress no later than 6 months after the enactment of this Act, and shall contain a detailed statement of the findings and conclusions of the Secretary, together with his recommendations for such legislation and administrative actions as he considers appropriate.

I have suggested to the Senate that the action taken by the conferees is responsive to the objections and concerns

that were raised in our letter from the administration on that subject. And here, at the very last minute, the Democratic leader raises this issue and spends a good deal of his time talking about this as the reason why the administration ought to veto the conference report.

Another subject that was raised was price reporting. We also got a letter from the Office of Management and Budget as well as the Secretary of Agriculture, responding to our bill and suggesting things that they think need the attention of conferees. If they have objections to provisions, they say so in either the OMB letter or the Secretary of Agriculture's letter.

On the subject of price reporting, there was a USDA request to review any final language adopted by the conferees. Here is what the conferees provided in the statement of managers on that issue:

The conferees direct the Secretary of Agriculture to take steps to increase the voluntary reporting of fed cattle, and wholesale beef carcass prices and volumes on a quality and yield-grade basis, as well as the prices and volumes of boxed beef. . . . The Secretary shall encourage the reporting of the price differential for USDA Prime, the upper 2/3 of USDA Choice, and a sub-select price category. Reports should include imported beef products and livestock.

Then we go on to say:

The Secretary of Agriculture shall compile and publish price, volume sales, and the shipment information regarding all exports and imports of beef, veal, lamb, and products thereof which is collected via the expanded voluntary process. . . . The Secretary shall also standardize the Agriculture Marketing Service price reporting data collection activities to ensure uniformity and complete sales data capture and to maximize the information available to all aspects of the industry.

The Secretary shall report to Congress, not more than 6 months after enactment, on the feasibility or need for mandatory price reporting. . . .

I suggest, Mr. President, that the conferees have done a very good job of trying to deal with these two issues in this conference. We have responded to the concerns expressed by the Secretary of Agriculture in his letter to us of September 24 giving us his reaction to our bill. Never did they single out in the letters to us that this would trigger a veto if we didn't do such and such with either one of those provisions. There was no such suggestion made.

There was a veto threat in the letter from the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, and here is what the veto threat says:

If the bill presented to the President includes the unacceptable FDA language—

And, by the way, that has been removed from the bill in conference, the so-called RU486 issue—

and agriculture disaster provisions that provide inadequate indemnity assistance or are inconsistent with the Daschle/Harkin proposal, his senior advisers would recommend that he veto the bill. We look forward to working with you to resolve these concerns.

The veto message, if this is a veto message, is that if we don't enact the Daschle/Harkin disaster indemnity assistance proposal, then the senior advisers will recommend to the President that he veto the bill.

We have talked about the disaster assistance proposal and why we think the direct assistance is much to be preferred over rewriting a portion of the 1996 farm bill as proposed by Daschle/Harkin, and we certainly think that is not good policy. It won't serve to increase prices for farmers at market, which is what we are trying to do to help ensure a brighter future for American production agriculture.

Mr. President, I urge the Senate to approve the conference report on Agriculture appropriations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. CHAFEE. Mr. President, I wonder if I may be yielded 1 minute or 2 minutes.

Mr. COCHRAN. I am happy to yield a minute to the distinguished Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island is recognized for 1 minute.

METHYL BROMIDE

Mr. CHAFEE. Mr. President, this bill contains a rider that addresses methyl bromide use. It is an anti-environmental rider offered by a few members of the other party, and slipped into the bill by the conference committee. It has not been debated by either body, and yet this language amends the Clean Air Act and constrains our ability to negotiate a more rapid phase-out of methyl bromide use with other nations.

Just last week, the White House, and specifically Vice President GORE, called on the Congress to end what he called "backdoor assaults" on the environment. I sincerely hope that the President and Vice President mean that to apply to all anti-environmental riders, including the ones offered by their own party.

This methyl bromide rider began as an effort to address a legitimate problem, but changes sought by a few members of the other party go too far. Methyl bromide is highly toxic and a potent ozone depleting compound. It is also one of the most widely used pesticides in the United States. The 1994 Montreal Protocol requires a gradual phase-out of methyl bromide beginning next year. Industrialized countries have agreed to a phase-out by 2005, while developing nations must phase-out methyl bromide by 2015. In the United States, the Clean Air Act requires an even earlier phase-out date for methyl bromide—January 1, 2001.

I share the concern that the Clean Air Act's accelerated phase-out schedule might put our farmers at a competitive disadvantage. However, I believe that addressing this problem in the context of an appropriations bill is

entirely inappropriate. Putting constraints on an international treaty and modifying a major environmental statute demands thoughtful debate. To do this with a rider on an appropriations bill allows almost no debate.

The principle argument for action on methyl bromide has been the potential competitive disadvantage for American agriculture. As I said, I am sympathetic to that problem, and I support the idea that we should allow the Montreal Protocol to dictate the phase-out in this nation. But the language added to this bill would prohibit any phase-out earlier than the date currently contained in the Protocol—2005.

Could the deadline for phase-out be accelerated if, a few years down the road, the international community decides that effective, affordable alternatives to methyl bromide exist? Not if we approve this rider. This language says that—no matter what—the United States will not end methyl bromide use before 2005. The international community is not going to negotiate an earlier date, because they know that the U.S. will not comply with an earlier date. Inclusion of that language guarantees that worldwide methyl bromide use will continue until 2005.

This is an inappropriate limitation on our options regarding methyl bromide and our ability to negotiate changes to an international treaty. More importantly, a last minute appropriations rider is a bad way to amend the Clean Air Act. I can only hope that the President, the Vice President, and Democratic Senators who have spoken against other riders intend to oppose all anti-environmental riders, not just those offered by Republicans.

Mr. President, I am distressed over the methyl bromide amendment which is an anti-environmental rider that was put into this conference report. It wasn't debated by either body, yet the language amends the Clean Air Act and constrains our ability to negotiate a more rapid phaseout of methyl bromide when used by other nations.

I point out that the principal argument for action on methyl bromide has been the potential competitive disadvantage for American agriculture. I am sympathetic of that, and I support the idea we should allow the Montreal Protocol to dictate the phaseout of this. If we don't like it, then we should amend it.

The present time for the phaseout is 2005 but could be earlier. What this legislation does is makes it no later than 2005 but prevents it from being earlier than 2005. In those intervening 7 years, there well could be developed an alternative to methyl bromide. I think this is an unfortunate provision in the bill. I thank the Chair.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I rise in support of the conference report accompanying the Department of Agriculture and related agencies appropriations bill for fiscal year 1999.

The final bill provides \$59.6 billion in new budget authority (BA) and \$44.8 billion in new outlays to fund most of the programs of the Department of Agriculture and other related agencies. All of the funding in this bill is non-defense spending. The conference report now includes "emergency" funding totaling \$4.3 billion in budget authority and \$4.1 billion in outlays to provide relief to the nation's farmers.

When outlays for prior-year appropriations and other adjustments are taken into account, the conference agreement totals \$59.4 billion in BA and \$51.6 billion in outlays for fiscal year 1999. Including mandatory savings, the subcommittee is \$1 million in budget authority below its 302(b) allocation, and at its 302(b) allocation for outlays.

The Senate Agriculture Appropriations Subcommittee revised 302(b) allocation totals \$59.4 billion in budget authority (BA) and \$51.6 billion in outlays. Within this amount, \$17.9 billion in BA and \$18.1 billion in outlays is for nondefense discretionary spending, including agricultural emergency spending.

For discretionary spending in the bill, and counting (scoring) all the mandatory savings in the bill, the final bill is \$4.0 billion in BA and \$3.9 billion in outlays above the President's budget request for these programs. The bill is at least \$4 billion in both BA and outlays above the Senate- and House-passed bills, all due to the addition of the emergency disaster assistance for farmers.

The disaster aid package includes \$2.2 billion in direct payments to farmers experiencing crop losses due to natural and other disasters. The Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act as amended prohibits "emergency" spending for purposes of crop disaster assistance. The conference agreement includes directed scorekeeping language allowing the emergency designation to be used in this case. This conference report therefore violates Section 306(a) of the Congressional Budget Act by including legislative language under the jurisdiction of the Budget Committee that was not reported by the Senate Budget Committee.

I recognize the difficulty of bringing this bill to the floor at its 302(b) allocation and in addressing the need for disaster assistance by farmers in many parts of the nation, including New Mexico and parts of the Southwest.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a table displaying the Senate Budget Committee scoring of the final bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

H.R. 4101, AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATIONS, 1999—SPENDING COMPARISONS—CONFERENCE REPORT

[Fiscal year 1999, in millions of dollars]

	Defense	Nondefense	Crime	Mandatory	Total
Conference Report:					
Budget authority		17,909		41,460	59,369
Outlays		18,121		33,429	51,550
Senate 302(b) allocation:					
Budget authority		17,910		41,460	59,370
Outlays		18,121		33,429	51,550
1998 level:					
Budget authority		13,930		35,048	48,978
Outlays		14,227		35,205	49,432
President's request:					
Budget authority		13,672		41,460	55,132
Outlays		14,056		33,429	47,485
House-passed bill:					
Budget authority		13,596		41,460	55,056
Outlays		14,031		33,429	47,460
Senate-passed bill:					
Budget authority		13,698		41,460	55,158
Outlays		14,069		33,429	47,498
Conference Report compared to:					
Senate 302(b) allocation:					
Budget authority		-1			-1
Outlays					
1998 level:					
Budget authority		3,979		6,412	10,391
Outlays		3,894		-1,776	2,118
President's request:					
Budget authority		4,237			4,237
Outlays		4,065			4,065
House-passed bill:					
Budget authority		4,313			4,313
Outlays		4,090			4,090
Senate-passed bill:					
Budget authority		4,211			4,211
Outlays		4,052			4,052

Note: Details may not add to totals due to rounding. Totals adjusted for consistency with current scorekeeping conventions.

Mr. BUMPERS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. BUMPERS. How much time do I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 1 minute 12 seconds.

Mr. BUMPERS. Mr. President, I join my friend and colleague, Senator COCHRAN, in bringing to the floor the conference report to accompany H.R. 4101, the fiscal year 1999 appropriations bill for agriculture, rural development and related agencies. This is the last annual agriculture appropriations bill which I will jointly author with my friend from Mississippi, and I regret to report that the progress this year has not been as smooth as in years past. Last year, my fellow conferees were able to conclude the business of the committee on conference in approximately 5 minutes. By contrast, it took us 5 days this year and I fear, at this late date, all hurdles toward enactment are not fully cleared. In fact, I, along with all Senate Democrat members of the conference committee who attached our signatures to the official conference papers, did so with an exception to one of the titles included in the conference report.

Aside from the one area still in disagreement, the conference report before us is as good a product as was possible under the budgetary constraints we faced. We include in this measure nearly \$52 million in new spending for food safety. This figure is well below the budget request, but represents a good increase in spending for the Department of Agriculture and the Food and Drug Administration to help ensure that our Nation's food supplies remain the safest in the world.

The conference report also provides adequate levels for the Women, Infants, and Children (WIC) Program, including an increase for the WIC Farmers Mar-

ket Program of up to \$15 million. Overall, the USDA food assistance programs remain the single largest component of this conference report, totaling \$36 billion in new spending.

Rural development is another key element of this conference report. Included is more than \$4.25 billion in rural housing program levels and nearly \$725 million in budget authority for the Rural Community Advancement Program, which includes the water and wastewater program. I have seen firsthand the benefits these programs bring to rural areas in my State and I am glad we were able to achieve these levels for the coming year. Also, the conference report includes a special recognition for the needs of the Lower Mississippi River Delta, an often overlooked region of our Nation that has long deserved our special attention. I have worked for many years to improve conditions in this region and I am happy to have included special consideration for the delta in this measure.

Agricultural research continues to receive the attention of our subcommittee. The level of spending for the Agricultural Research Service in this conference report is higher than either the House or Senate levels prior to conference. In addition, we were able to increase the levels of funding for basic formula research for our Nation's 1862, 1890, and 1994 institutions. Funding for these institutions has been frozen for far too long, and this conference report provides a 7 percent increase above last year. Enhanced agricultural research is a commitment the Congress has made to our farmers and consumers and this conference report lies up to that commitment.

I would be most remiss if I didn't pause to give credit, to my friend, Senator COCHRAN, for facing the grim budgetary challenge we faced this year.

Our allocation was well below what was available for fiscal year 1998 and going into conference we had to adjust our numbers downward toward the lower House allocation. Our task was made even more difficult by the assumed enactment of hundreds of millions of dollars in user fees that looked good on paper but only served to raise faint expectations beyond what was possible. This conference report includes a general provision that will, hopefully, forestall the use of projected user fees in next year's budget and keep everyone working within a budgetary framework more closely associated with the realities we all must face.

Given my years of work on this subcommittee, and my close friendship with Senator COCHRAN, I am greatly saddened by my reluctance to give unequivocal support for all matters contained in this conference report. As we began conference deliberations with the House, the President made it clear that two items under discussion were of such importance that their inclusion in the conference report would result in a veto. I must admit that I never thought the agriculture appropriations bill would ever be the target of a Presidential veto. In fact, the agriculture appropriations bill is usually approved by the Senate 100 to 0. I remind my colleagues that a few years ago when much of the Federal Government faced a shutdown from failed appropriations bills, the agencies funded under this bill were among the few not included in that Governmental debacle. Such has been the history of the agriculture appropriations process during my tenure and it saddens me to think that I might be leaving the Senate with that possibility lurking as strongly as it does today.

One of the items which drew the attention of the President was a provision in the House bill that placed a limitation on the Food and Drug Administration's funding for any testing, development, or approval of the drug RU-486, a chemical used to induce an abortion. Leaving for a moment the argument that science is better left to scientists than politicians, the inclusion of the abortion debate in the agriculture appropriations bill was a most unfortunate attempt to drag this bill down with one of the most divisive and politically charged issues of our time. I am very pleased to report that the Senate conferees made it crystal clear that the Senate was not going to allow the issue of abortion to infect the agriculture appropriations bill with the same paralysis that has inflicted other subcommittees. If the Senate had not held firm, a very bad precedent would have been set and all agriculture appropriations bills in the future would become the venue for, and be held hostage by, an issue best reserved for other forums.

The other item of Presidential disapproval is tied to the levels of assistance for farmers and ranchers who are facing the most pressing financial times in recent years, maybe ever. It is on this point that I had to part with my friend Senator COCHRAN and express an opinion that our measure falls short of meeting current needs.

The conference report includes provisions put forward by the majority party that strives to bring relief to farmers and ranchers who are suffering from lost crops and low prices. However, my concern is with the manner in which the assistance is to be provided. In order to help farmers suffering from low prices, the conference report would simply allow for additional "Freedom to Farm" payments to go to all producers who hold a Agricultural Market Transition Act contract. The fallacy with this approach is that it does not target the additional funds to people who are suffering from either crop failure or fallen prices. Instead, it makes funds available to landlords who may have received cash rent for their lands, suffered no loss at all, and in many instances never even faced a risk of loss in the first place.

We have to recognize that many, though not all, farmers across America are suffering. Most are suffering from losses this year, but some from losses over several years. Some farmers have a crop to harvest, but low prices preclude any chance of a profit. The purpose of the Democratic alternative for disaster assistance is to make sure the relief payments go to those in need.

I have heard from farmers in my State who have lost everything this year. They tell me that this year is worse than the crop failures of 1980, which was the worst year since the Great Depression. The Democratic alternative provides more relief, 100 percent more in fact, for farmers in my State and I feel we should not turn our

backs on the one segment of the national economy that has not been surging into double digit profits on Wall Street. The President has indicated he will veto this bill if additional farm relief is not added. Congress needs to act swiftly to amend the shortfall in this bill and send to the President a package that truly meets the needs of farmers and ranchers.

Mr. President, this brings me to the close of my last annual agriculture appropriations bill on the floor of the Senate. I want to once more thank my distinguished colleague, Senator COCHRAN, for his years of friendship on and off this subcommittee. I also want to thank all other members for their cooperation over the years.

Mr. President, I say in closing that this is a very complex matter, this matter of disaster relief. The only disagreement on this side and the other side of the aisle is over the disaster provisions. As I say, they are both fairly complicated, and I am hoping that if the President vetoes the bill, as he has promised to do, we will be able to work out something—maybe not everything the President wanted, maybe more than others wanted—and that we will be able to reach a compromise that will actually take care of farmers.

My fear is that, this being what I consider probably the worst year in the history for agriculture since the Great Depression, that the proposal in the bill is not adequate to save an awful lot of farmers who deserve saving. So I am hoping if the President does veto the bill, we can come back and hammer out an agreement that will save a lot more farmers.

I yield the remainder of my time.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, have the yeas and nays been ordered on the conference report?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. They have not been ordered.

Mr. COCHRAN. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has expired. The question is on agreeing to the conference report accompanying H.R. 4101. The yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. FORD. I announce that the Senator from Ohio (Mr. GLENN) and the Senator from New York (Mr. MOYNIHAN) are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from New York (Mr. MOYNIHAN) would vote "aye."

The result was announced—yeas 55, nays 43, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 298 Leg.]

YEAS—55

Abraham
Allard
Ashcroft
Bennett
Bond

Boxer
Breaux
Brownback
Campbell
Chafee

Coats
Cochran
Collins
Coverdell
Craig

D'Amato
DeWine
Domenici
Enzi
Faircloth
Feinstein
Frist
Gorton
Gramm
Grams
Grassley
Hagel
Hatch
Helms

Hutchinson
Hutchison
Inhofe
Jeffords
Kempthorne
Landrieu
Leahy
Lott
Lugar
Mack
McCain
McConnell
Murkowski
Nickles

Roberts
Roth
Sessions
Shelby
Smith (NH)
Smith (OR)
Snowe
Specter
Stevens
Thompson
Thurmond
Warner

NAYS—43

Akaka
Baucus
Biden
Bingaman
Bryan
Bumpers
Burns
Byrd
Cleland
Conrad
Daschle
Dodd
Dorgan
Durbin
Feingold

Ford
Graham
Gregg
Harkin
Hollings
Inouye
Johnson
Kennedy
Kerrey
Kerry
Kohl
Kyl
Lautenberg
Levin
Lieberman

Mikulski
Moseley-Braun
Murray
Reed
Reid
Robb
Rockefeller
Santorum
Sarbanes
Thomas
Torricelli
Wellstone
Wyden

NOT VOTING—2

Glenn

Moynihan

The conference report was agreed to.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. CRAIG. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. LOTT addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader is recognized.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there now be a period for morning business until 4:15 p.m. today, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 5 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

DISTINGUISHED FLYING CROSS

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I rise today to recognize former Navy and Marine Corps members who received the Distinguished Flying Cross in accordance with section 532 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1999, which waived time limitations for award of this decoration for specified persons. These awards were recommended by the Secretary of the Navy based upon requests from Members of Congress. These procedures were established by section 526 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1996 to resolve a dilemma under which deserving individuals were denied the recognition they deserved solely due to the passage of time. I am proud to have established a procedure that enables these distinguished veterans to receive the honors they earned. We are very proud of their dedicated service to our Nation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a list of all who were awarded the Distinguished Flying Cross be printed in the RECORD.